SHOMURA

FAO Fisheries Reports, No. 180 FID/R180 (En)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL INDIAN OCEAN FISHERY SURVEY AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Report of the fifth session of the

INDIAN OCEAN FISHERY COMMISSION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Rome, 12-14 April 1976

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

REPORT

of the

fifth session of the

INDIAN OCEAN FISHERY COMMISSION

Executive Committee for the Implementation of the International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme

Rome, 12-14 April 1976

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

M-40

ISBN 92-5- 100036-X

The copyright in this book is vested in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, by any method or process, without written permission from the copyright holder. Applications for such permission, with a statement of the purpose and extent of the reproduction desired, should be addressed to the Director, Publications Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

© FAO

PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

This is the final version of the Report as approved by the Fifth Session of the Indian Ocean Fishery Commission Executive Committee for the Implementation of the International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme and accepted by the Indian Ocean Fishery Commission.

Distribution:

FAO Department of Fisheries
FAO Regional Fishery Officers
Members of the Executive Committee
Members of the Indian Ocean Fishery Commission
Other interested nations and organizations

Bibliographic Entry:

Indian Ocean Fishery Commission. Executive Committee for the Implementation of the International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme. Rome, 12-14 April 1976 (1976)
FAO Fish.Rep., (180):15 p.
Report of the fifth session of the ...

Conferences. Reports. Fisheries. Fishery surveys. Resource development. Fisheries statistics. Education. Artisanal fishing.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/fao-fisheries-and-aquaculture-report_1976-04_180

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs
THE SESSION	1 - 2
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION	3
INTERNATIONAL INDIAN OCEAN FISHERY SURVEY AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME	4 - 19
REPORT OF THE UNDP/FAO REVIEW AND EVALUATION MISSION	20 - 37
FUTURE ACTIVITIES	38 - 45
ANY OTHER MATTERS	46 - 47
DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION	48

THE SESSION

1 The Indian Ocean Fishery Commission Executive Committee for the Implementation of the International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme held its Fifth Session from 12 to 14 April 1976 at FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy. Seventeen nations participated in the Session, including nine nations that are members of the Executive Committee. A representative of the United Nations Development Programme also participated. A list of delegates and observers is given in Appendix C to this report.

2 The Session was chaired by Mr. N. Odero (Kenya). The representatives were welcomed in an address by Dr. H. Kasahara, Director, Fishery Resources Division in the absence of Mr. F.E. Popper, Assistant Director-General (Fisheries). The full text of this address is given in Appendix D to this report.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SESSION

3 The Committee adopted the agenda reproduced in Appendix A. The documents which were available to the Committee are listed in Appendix B.

INTERNATIONAL INDIAN OCEAN FISHERY SURVEY AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Progress Report of the Programme Leader

4 The Committee was informed by the Programme Leader of the progress made since its last session held in Rome in October 1974. Since the Committee was to discuss under item 4 of the agenda the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission Report, which covered all the IOP activities in a very comprehensive way, the Programme Leader concentrated on certain issues which he felt should be brought to the attention of the Committee. It was noted that, due to the cutbacks by the UNDP in its spending programme for 1976, the IOP budget for Phase II had been reduced from U.S.$ 4.3 million to U.S.$ 3.8 million. This meant, inter alia, that the U.S.$ 200 000 reserved from UNDP funds for four workshops on Fishery Development Planning and Project Preparation and on Fishery Statistics would not be available in 1976. Attempts were being made to secure funds from other sources.

5 The Committee was informed that the staff of the Programme had been brought up to nine members and consisted of H.C. Winsor (Canada), Programme Leader; S.K. Banerji (India), Stock Assessment and Statistics; A. Labon (Poland), Economics/Investment Analysis; N. Gustafsson (Sweden), Processing and Marketing; S. Hayasi (Japan), Resource Management; M. Nikolic (Yugoslavia), Mariculture; L. Birkett (United Kingdom), Coordinator and Cruise Leader of the East African Survey; R.L. Payne (Canada), Industry Advisor (financed from CIDA Trust Funds); A. Sribhibhadh (Thailand), Government Institutions.

6 The Committee's attention was drawn to paragraphs 40-99 and Appendix (v) of IOFC:X/5/76/9 (Report of the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission), as well as to progress reports IOFC:X/5/76/5, 6 and 8 concerning the major resource survey activities.

7 In regard to Future Programme Activities it was noted that the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission Report (IOFC:X/5/76/9) set forth in Chapter V "Considerations for future IOP Activities" and document IOFC:X/5/76/9, Sup. 1 gave the views of the Department of Fisheries on the future of the IOP. It was also pointed out that there were ongoing activities initiated by the IOP, particularly the North Arabian Sea Survey, East African Survey, South Indonesia/West Australia Survey and the Gulf Project as well as the Red Sea Project which was still in the course of preparation. Coordination of these activities and translation of their results into action programmes were mandatory functions of the IOP.

8 The observer from Norway, on behalf of the Fisheries Research Institute, Bergen, introduced the Status Report of the North Arabian Sea Survey (IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.10) which covered

the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN findings in 1975. It was noted that three areas of potential interest to commercial fishery were identified in 1975: the north-east Somali coast; the Arabian coast between Ras Al Kulb and Ras Al Hadd; and the shelf off Pakistan. The 1976 operations of the research vessel should thus concentrate on these areas.

9 The delegate of Kenya expressed his appreciation of the survey work done so far by the IOP, stating that it created great interest in the countries concerned. The results of the surveys, however, werestill preliminary due to the short time which had elapsed since their commencement and therefore potential investors were still holding back awaiting more firm indications of the availability of fishery resources. It was therefore essential that more survey work should be done as well as indicative fishing and the results made available to those interested in developing fisheries.

10 The delegate of Japan elaborated on the survey carried out by the R/V SHOYO MARU off Pakistan, during which concentrations of squid (Symplectotuthis oualaniensis) were found incidentally. This species might have an excellent market in some countries. Since these resources needed to be further investigated with respect to distribution, abundance and ecological character the Government of Japan had agreed to repeat the survey in close collaboration with the IOP from October 1976 until January 1977 to obtain more data on a continuing basis. Scientists from the region would be welcome on board the R/V SHOYO MARU. It was hoped that the R/V SHOYO MARU would have a chance to meet the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN again for exchange of experience and comparison of survey results. The IOP was requested to facilitate both a rendez-vous between the two research vessels and the necessary clearance of the coastal countries concerned.

11 Problems regarding the operation of research vessels under the IOP in territorial waters of member countries were briefly explained even though survey programmes were endorsed by the IOFC. The IOP was required to obtain permission for the research vessels to operate in territorial waters of the individual countries and sometimes it took a long time before appropriate documents were issued by the governments concerned. In some cases such permission was not granted in time and the vessel's cruise plans had to be changed. The Chairman requested the delegations to bring the problem to the attention of the respective authorities as it was felt that all IOP member countries should facilitate the survey work.

12 The delegates of Indonesia, Tanzania and the United States expressed their appreciation for the work done by the IOP, a view that was shared by the other delegates. Indonesia hoped that the activities carried out so far would contribute to Phase III becoming a reality. Concern was expressed about the UNDP liquidity problems as the Government of Indonesia was anxious to carry out comprehensive resource surveys off the country's coast and was prepared to make available two research vessels for this purpose. It was noted that the IOP hoped to incorporate the South Indonesia/West Australia survey in its programme and that the equipment and expertise needed for the research vessels would be provided. In view of UNDP liquidity limitations, alternative sources of funding were now being sought. Tanzania was satisfied with the work done so far and was anxious to cooperate in every possible way. Programmes to enable the countries of the region to exploit the available fishery resources were needed and their existence was encouraging. The United States had supported and would continue to support IOP activities. It was pointed out that it was encouraging to see that the member countries approved of what was being done by the IOP.

13 The observer from Norway discussed the use of the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN, with particular reference to funding ongoing and future surveys. It was pointed out that plans for extension of the North Arabian Sea survey should be flexible as it might be necessary to extend the vessel's operations for a period of six months to a year rather than the five or six months referred to in IOFC:X/5/76/4, paragraph 8. With regard to the comtemplated use of the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN for the South Indonesia/West Australia survey, it should be noted that use of the vessel had been suggested earlier by FAO as an element of a comprehensive development programme; NORAD would always consider IOP needs with sympathy. The present funding

arrangements for the R/V DR. FRIDTJOF NANSEN, i.e. 40 percent paid by IOP and 60 percent by NORAD, were valid for the North Arabian Sea survey until the end of 1977. It was hoped that the UNDP would continue to support these surveys but in view of the UNDP limitation of funds, it might be necessary to request NORAD to take responsibility for the full operating cost. The IOP Programme Leader stated that NORAD had always been most understanding and cooperative in tackling problems of this kind. In the North Arabian Sea area there were two new research vessels being commissioned and there was an urgent need for adequately trained people to run the vessels and make full use of information provided by them.

14 The delegate of Kenya expressed appreciation for the assistance received by countries from IOP, the work of which was stimulating considerable interest in the area. A number of countries would wish to follow up on the results of the survey work immediately as they urgently needed to meet demand for fish. Test fishing operations were strongly supported because there was a need for more precise information on the fishery resources and it was hoped it would help to attract funds to the fishery sector.

15 The delegate of Australia was pleased to note that Indonesia was still interested in the proposed South Indonesia/West Australia survey in which Australia was also keenly interested. It was noted that the Federal Republic of Germany and Norway might support the survey.

16 Several delegates stressed the need for training, including training for skippers, marine engineers, biologists and stock assessment specialists. Many countries had shown interest in training by their response to the opportunity to nominate candidates for the R/V DR.FRIDTJOF NANSEN and the R/V PROFESSOR MESYATSEV although the number of places available was limited. Future surveys should also be combined with training.

17 The Committee noted the Programme reports of interest to all member countries (IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.2, 3, 4, 5, 10). The Committee's attention was drawn to documents IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.11 and 12 - summaries of cruise reports of the R/V SHOYO MARU and the R/V PROFESSOR SIEDLECKI respectively. The Committee noted the importance of the studies and expressed the view that they would help to stimulate interest in fishery development in the region and therefore should be given wide circulation.

18 The delegate of Kenya enquired whether the "Small-boat longline tuna fishing: a feasibility study" had been brought up-to-date as far as the cost of operations and prices were concerned. It was noted that the figures were up to date for mid-1975 but were presented in such a way as to make further revisions possible as new data became available.

19 The idea of an IOP periodical newsletter was raised; this was under consideration. It would be essential to ensure a high standard for such a periodical publication, together with regularity in issuing it.

REPORT OF THE UNDP/FAO REVIEW AND EVALUATION MISSION

20 The Mission Leader introduced the Report of the Mission which had carried out its work both at Project Headquarters in Rome and at various field stations over the period 19 January-18 February 1976. The Mission was of the unanimous view that the IOP had played a major role in promoting and coordinating fishery development in the Indian Ocean area and, arising out of its review, expressed its complete confidence in the leadership of the Programme and the work of its staff. It further noted that, although the patterns of national jurisdiction might change as a result of the outcome of the current discussions at the Conference on the Law of the Sea, this would in no way reduce the importance of the role of the IOP; on the contrary, it would increase its responsibilities still further. While it was premature to attempt to specify the scale of investment and development which had resulted from the IOP's activities, the Mission was well satisfied that these would eventually emerge as very substantial. For the present it was clear that the work of the IOP had already created a growing awareness and interest in fishery development throughout the Indian Ocean.

21 In summarizing the report, the Mission Leader drew the attention of the Executive Committee to the following salient points:

(a) Extension of the Programme

The Mission Report expressed the view that the IOP should be extended for a third phase of five years starting in January 1977, during which period it would require international funding of approximately U.S.$ 6 million. This was the absolute minimum level of funding necessary for the Programme to carry out its functions effectively and provided for a modest strengthening and restructuring of the Programme staff.

(b) Resource surveys

The programme of resource surveys should be continued so as to provide the necessary information base for development planning. It was essential that indicative fishing operations should be built into these survey programmes to prove the resources and provide, at the earliest opportunity, essential information on suitable fishing methods and potential catch rates, thus allowing an early start to industry development.

(c) Other pre-investment and investment activities

The Mission Report placed the highest importance on the need for continuing efforts to identify sources of support and funding for the initiation of industry development and commended the IOP for the efforts already made in that direction.

(d) Statistics

The Mission Report confirmed the need for the improvement of fishery statistics throughout the Indian Ocean area and noted that this need would inevitably increase as the fisheries of the area developed further. It noted that the establishment of elaborate statistical systems in itself might not be the complete answer and suggested that the IOP's best approach to the task was by providing assistance for improving statistics related to specific identified development needs.

(e) Resource management

Bearing in mind the present state of fishery development in the Indian Ocean, the Mission felt that the current level of activity of the IOP in this field was appropriate; however, as development intensified the need for management action in certain fisheries would become important and the Programme must be prepared for strengthening its work in that field.

(f) Training

The Mission Report stressed the need to make maximum use of existing national and regional training institutions throughout the area, in preference to creating new ones. It endorsed present activities and commended the Programme for conducting a series of short training seminars and workshops on subjects of common concern.

22 The Committee received the report with appreciation. It expressed its confidence and satisfaction with the direction and scope of IOP activities and fully supported the proposal for an extension of the Programme into a third phase of five years, starting in January 1977, at the suggested funding level of approximately U.S.$ 6 million

23 The UNDP representative congratulated the IOP on its achievements to date. He assured the Committee that a draft of the Mission Report had already received a favourable reception in UNDP and that the final report and its recommendations, together with those of the Executive Committee, would be taken fully into account in deciding the content of UNDP support for the extension of the IOP. He confirmed that UNDP recognized the considerable importance of the promotional and coordinating role of IOP for the development of the fisheries in the Indian Ocean area and assured the Committee that UNDP would in principle agree to provide continuing support and funding during the proposed extension period. Although he was not, at this stage, able to indicate the precise level of financing which would be forthcoming, it would, during 1977, hopefully be at more or less the same level as in 1976 but excluding the

supplementary funding which had been provided.

24 It was noted that the Department of Fisheries was also in general agreement with the recommendations of the Review Mission. The Department had confirmed that the areas on which the Mission had recommended that the IOP should concentrate its efforts were in accord with the priority areas identified by the FAO Committee on Fisheries. With regard to the proposed level of funding for Phase III, the Department held the view that this was realistic in view of the vast extent of the Project area and the fact that it included many countries classified amongst the least developed and most seriously affected by present world conditions.

25 There was general agreement on the continuing importance of small-scale fisheries to the countries of the Indian Ocean area and the need for the IOP to provide assistance to this sector through well integrated projects which took account of all factors from catching to marketing and which made adequate provision for the socio-economic needs of the fishing communities concerned.

26 Whilst not unmindful of the problems relating to the further development of small-scale fisheries, the need for the rapid establishment of deep sea and large-scale fisheries was also stressed and it was agreed that ways and means of coordinating development in these two sectors should be underlined.

27 The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Mission that the Programme Leader should establish his own work priorities but emphasized that these priorities should be in harmony with those of the IOFC and the Department of Fisheries, this being particularly important in the light of changing situations which might develop as an outcome of the current discussions at the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

28 The Committee recognized the continuing importance of the IOP for the development of fisheries in the Indian Ocean area. With a view to avoiding duplication of effort, it stressed the importance of maintaining the closest cooperation between the IOP and the bi-lateral agencies which were active in the Indian Ocean. It also drew attention to the need to take full account of the various bilateral fishery programmes planned or under way in the area, which were important to overall development.

29 The Committee also shared the Mission's views concerning the need for the continuation of resource surveys. In view of the continuing nature of this programme of surveys, it was suggested that it would be beneficial if the IOP could establish its long-term needs for research and survey vessels, including operational costs. The Committee shared the Mission's view that it was essential that indicative fishing should be included as an essential component of these surveys.

30 The Committee gave high priority to the identification of development and investment opportunities arising out of these surveys and other pre-investment activities; in this connection it asked that the IOP should continue to maintain the closest possible collaboration with appropriate Regional Banks and other funding agencies, and agreed with the Mission that these agencies should be fully involved in the planning of development and pre-investment activities at the earliest possible opportunity. It was hoped that the IOP would attempt to influence the scope of various aid programmes in the area to persuade the responsible authorities to give higher priority to fishery development. The Committee also noted that efforts should be made to enlist support and investment funding for pre-feasibility studies already completed.

31 In general, the Committee endorsed the Mission's recommendations with regard to training. It emphasized that such training should be directed, in the main, at improving the capabilities of extension workers and field staff of national fisheries departments and at increasing the availability of all categories of sea-going and shore-based personnel required for developing industries; in this connection it hoped that further use could be made of the training facilities available on the various resource survey vessels. It further noted that consideration should be given to the introduction of alternative methods of improving the training of professional staff for the fisheries departments in the area. The Committee agreed

with the Mission's recommendations that maximum use should be made of existing national and regional institutions. In this connection the delegate of the Republic of Korea confirmed the availability of training facilities at the Deep Sea Fishery Training Centre in Pusan, created with UNDP/FAO assistance.

32 In considering the work of the IOP in statistics, the Committee agreed with the recommendation of the Mission. It noted that, when developing statistical systems for the countries in the area, it would be beneficial to collaborate with and enlist the assistance of the various central government statistical departments and bureaux in the countries concerned. There was also agreement with the recommendations of the Mission concerning the role of the IOP in resource management without duplicating activities of other bodies. It was stressed that a priority area for the IOP should be the strengthening of national capabilities in this direction.

33 The Committee noted the Mission's recommendations with regard to the role of joint ventures. It agreed that these had played, and would continue to play, an important role in accelerating fishery industries development in the Indian Ocean area but that other ways and means of bringing this about should not be overlooked; it was important to remember that both in this field and in the field of training, the type of technology being transferred from the developed to the developing countries should be compatible with the needs of the latter.

34 The Committee believed that the IOP should consider mariculture as an integral part of overall fishery development with considerable potential in many parts of the region; for that reason it felt that the IOP should, in collaboration with other units of the Department of Fisheries, continue to play an active role in assisting countries in the area in identifying opportunities for development in this sector.

35 The Committee was informed that the Indian Ocean Programme worked within the framework of policies laid down by the FAO Department of Fisheries, by the FAO Conference and Council, by the Committee of Fisheries and by the Indian Ocean Fishery Commission. The meeting noted that the IOP did not report to the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council, although the Council's area of responsibility extended into the eastern part of the Indian Ocean. Some coordination was achieved by organizing joint working parties and IPFC was kept regularly informed of IOP activities.

36 In response to points arising in the Mission's report or raised by delegates during the discussion, the Programme Leader indicated that, with respect to recommendation (iii) in the Mission's Report, he considered the problem of setting priorities mainly in relation to the allocation of IOP staff time between its responsibilities for project identification, formulation, coordination and monitoring. He expressed some concern about the monitoring responsibility which could take up a great deal of staff time and which might impinge on the functions of the Department of Fisheries Operations Service and technical divisions and units; however, he acknowledged the need to keep in close contact with progress in major projects formulated by the Programme and indicated that he would explore the best ways of achieving this. He considered the Mission's recommendation would be helpful in that respect.

37 In summing up the discussion of this agenda item, the Chairman indicated the Committee's general approval of the Mission's Report and its agreement with its main conclusions and specific recommendations. He considered, however, that in the light of the comments made by some delegates, it would be advisable to retain mariculture within the Programme's activities. He indicated that the capacity of the Programme to undertake the wide range of activities envisaged in Phase III would be governed by the amount of funds available. Although this could not be specified at the present time, he noted with appreciation the UNDP's decision to provide funds in 1977.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Bay of Bengal - SIDA proposal

38 The delegate of Sweden introduced the SIDA document tabled as IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 13, explaining the history and background of the proposal. The socio-economic aspects of small-

scale fishery development were of major concern to SIDA. Collection and distribution of information, technology and socio-economic conditions were important aspects to be analysed before drawing up programmes for development. Assistance in planning, education, development of means of production were major problems to be solved with the assistance of groups of experts placed in the field. The total cost of a comprehensive five-year programme in the fisheries sector, as part of an integrated community development scheme, was estimated by SIDA at U.S.$ 6.7 million of which U.S.$ 180 000 for the preparatory phase was available immediately. During the preparatory phase a detailed action plan as well as a more detailed budget for the overall programme were to be worked out. A proposal for an action plan for the preparatory phase was also introduced.

39 The delegate of India, in expressing appreciation of the action proposed by SIDA, observed that details of the proposal would have to be looked at by specialists in his country. Any project must be based on available fishery resources, the existence of which had to be assured and it was not clear whether this project could be implemented without some prior fishery resource survey work. The resource surveys and other related projects might have to go hand in hand.

40 The observer from Norway expressed appreciation for the documents presented by SIDA and noted that the proposed project for Development of Traditional Fishing Communities in the Bay of Bengal region would have to be coordinated both on a national basis and by the IOP internationally. It was emphasized that the Indo-Norwegian project was an integrated one, of a long-term duration, since to achieve a real impact on the small communities a great deal of patient work was required.

41 The Committee noted that the preparatory phase would be initiated in close collaboration with and using the facilities of the operational UNDP Project "Development of Small-Scale Fisheries in West and South Asia". The Committee expressed its appreciation of the decision of SIDA to support a preparatory phase and hoped that funds would be made available for implementation of the full project.

Accelerated development of the artisanal fisheries

42 This proposal submitted for consideration by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) was introduced (IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 9). The salient points of the proposal including objectives, duration, cost, premises and mode of operation were explained. The project was complementary to the SIDA proposals in the sense that it provided for the assessment of resources potential through indicative fishing. It was also complementary to and a geographical extension of a similar operation being carried out by the South China Sea Fisheries Development and Coordination Programme. In addition it would be complementary to the east coast of India "Indicative Fishing Project" under consideration by UNDP. It was pointed out that CIDA's first reaction to this proposal was favourable and its further consideration was subject to the endorsement of recipient countries and a positive outcome of the evaluation of the SCSP pelagic operation.

43 The delegate of India found the proposal extremely interesting and expressed satisfaction with the envisaged long-term programme for development of suitable types of vessel. He felt that the proposal filled an existing gap in fishery resources assessment which should constitute the basis for other development activities under consideration. It was noted that the NORAD project for boat construction in India was of relevance to the comprehensive development programmes.

44 The Committee was informed that the CIDA Mission, which would be reviewing the SCSP pelagic operation, had expressed a wish to visit some of the recipient countries included in the proposal. Tentative timing of such visits would be the month of May. Based on these visits and further discussions of the IOP with the recipient countries, the final presentation of the proposal to CIDA should take place by the autumn. The Committee endorsed the proposal submitted for CIDA funding, noting that it was complementary to other projects in the area and met the need for indicative fishing and demonstration of fishing technology as a basis for accelerated development.

Other future activities

45 The Programme Leader referred to other future activities of the IOP which had already been discussed in connection with the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission report. These included:

North Arabian Sea Survey
East African Survey
South Indonesia/West Australia Survey
Red Sea Survey
Regional Fishery Survey and Development Project
Sub-Regional Fisheries Training Centre - Kuwait

ANY OTHER MATTERS

46 The Committee noted with interest the Summary of Bilateral Assistance to the Fisheries Sector - Indian Ocean Region (IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 14) which could be of use in coordinating international assistance. It expressed the hope that the document suitably modified (page 19 removed) would be presented to the next session of Committee on Fisheries in complete form.

47 In view of the UNDP liquidity problem, alternative sources for direct funding of IOP were informally explored. Various delegates felt that supplementary funding of the IOP would be possible for specific activities or through bilateral arrangements.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION

48 The Committee agreed that its next session should be held at the same time and place as the Fifth Session of IOFC in 1977 to facilitate attendance by delegates.

* * * * * *

APPENDIX A

AGENDA

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of agenda and arrangements for the session
3. International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme
   - (a) Progress report of the Programme Leader
   - (b) Programme reports
   - (c) Progress reports on
     - (i) Resource surveys: East African, North Arabian Sea and South Indonesia
     - (ii) Regional Fisheries Survey and Development Project (Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates)
     - (iii) Bay of Bengal Fisheries Development Programme
     - (iv) Proposals for survey and development of the Red Sea Fisheries
4. Report of the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission
5. Future activities
6. Any other matters
7. Date and place of the next session
8. Adoption of the report
9. Closing of the session

APPENDIX B

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

IOFC:X/5/76/1	Provisional Agenda
IOFC:X/5/76/2	Annotated Provisional Agenda
IOFC:X/5/76/3	Provisional Timetable
IOFC:X/5/76/4	Progress report of the Programme Leader
IOFC:X/5/76/5	Progress report on resource surveys: East Africa, North Arabian Sea and South Indonesia
IOFC:X/5/76/6	Progress report on the Regional Fisheries Survey and Development Project (Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates)
IOFC:X/5/76/7	Progress report on the Bay of Bengal Fisheries Development Programme
IOFC:X/5/76/8	Report on Proposals for Survey and Development of the Red Sea Fisheries
IOFC:X/5/76/9	Report of the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission
IOFC:X/5/76/9, Sup. 1	Views of the FAO Department of Fisheries on the Future of the Indian Ocean Programme
IOFC:X/5/76/9, Sup. 2	Summary of Report of the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission of the Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 1	List of documents
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 2	Small-boat longline tuna-fishing: a feasibility study
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 3	Joint Ventures in Fisheries
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 4	Improvement of National Fishery Statistics
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 5	Some Developments in the Tuna Fisheries in the Indian Ocean
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 6	Report of the Fourth Session of the IOFC Executive Committee
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 7	Information for Participants
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 8	List of delegates and observers
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf. 9	Project Proposal - Accelerated Development of the Artisanal Fisheries in the Indian Ocean Region - presented for consideration to CIDA

IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.10	Status Report North Arabian Sea Survey (1975)
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.11	Summary of Report - R/V SHOYO MARU cruise off Pakistan (1975)
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.12	Summary of Report - R/V PROF. SIEDLECKI cruise in the Indian Ocean (1975)
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.13	SIDA - Support for Development of Small-Scale Fisheries in the Bay of Bengal and a Plan of Action for the Preparatory Phase of 9/SIDA/5-Rev.1
IOFC:X/5/76/Inf.14	Summary of Bilateral Assistance to the Fisheries Sector - Indian Ocean Region

APPENDIX C

LIST OF DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Australia

CHRISTIAN, J.D.
First Secretary (Agriculture)
Embassy of Australia
Via Alessandria 215
00198 Rome, Italy

India

HAKIM, A.
Counsellor (Agriculture)
Embassy of the Republic of India
Lungotevere dei Mellini 17
00193 Rome, Italy

Indonesia

HAKIM, H.A.I.
Acting Permanent Representative
of Indonesia to FAO
Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia
Via Piemonte 127
00187 Rome, Italy

Japan

SAITO, T.
Counsellor and Alternate Permanent
Representative of Japan to FAO
Embassy of Japan
Via Quintino Sella 60
00187 Rome, Italy

Kenya

ODERO, N.
Director of Fisheries
Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife
P.O. Box 40241
Nairobi

Mauritius

Qatar

FARAH, M.S.
Head of the Extension Service
Ministry of Industry and Agriculture
P.O. Box 1966
Doha

Sweden

LINDQUIST, Dr. A.H.
Director
Institute of Marine Research
Havsfiskelaboratoriet
S-45300 Lysekil

RYDEN, P.
First Secretary
Swedish International Development
Authority (SIDA)
S-10525 Stockholm

Tanzania

LIBABA, G.K.
Director of Fisheries
P.O. Box 2462
Dar-es-Salaam

United States of America

ROEDEL, P.M.
Fisheries Advisor
Office of Agriculture
Bureau for Technical Assistance
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

OBSERVERS FROM MEMBER NATIONS OF
THE INDIAN OCEAN FISHERY COMMISSION,
NOT MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

France

CROSNIER, A.G.P.
Directeur de recherches
Office de la recherche scientifique
et technique outre-mer (ORSTOM)
24 rue Bayard
75008 Paris

TOFFIN, Son Excellence M. Jean-Louis
Ambassadeur, Représentant permanent
de la France auprès de l'OAA
Piazza Farnese 105
00186 Rome, Italie

Korea, Republic of

LEE, CHANG KI
Fisheries Attaché
Embassy of the Republic of Korea
Via Barnaba Oriani 30
00197 Rome, Italy

Madagascar

RALIBERA, R.
Représentant permanent suppléant
de Madagascar auprès de la FAO
Ambassade de la République Malagasy
Via R. Zandonai 84/A
00194 Rome, Italie

Norway

GERHARDSEN, Prof. G.M.
Observer for NORAD
Professor of Fisheries Economics
Institute of Fisheries Economics
Norwegian School of Economics
and Business Administration
5 000 Bergen

AASE, G.
Administrative Manager
Institute of Marine Research
P.O. Box 2906
Bergen-Nordnes

Sri Lanka

DAYANANDA, E.G.
Third Secretary
Embassy of the Republic of Sri Lanka
Via G. Cuboni 6
00197 Rome, Italy

Thailand

LAOWHAPHAN, P.
Permanent Representative of
Thailand to FAO
Royal Thai Embassy
Via Zara 9
00198 Rome, Italy

OBSERVERS FROM OTHER FAO MEMBER NATIONS

Canada

BOURQUE, J.L.
Executive Assistant to the Vice-President
Special Advisors Branch
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
Ottawa, Ontario

Yemen, People's Democratic Republic of

SHARAF, A.W.
Director
Fisheries Department
Public Corporation for Fish Wealth
Steamer Point
Aden

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

United Nations Development Programme

RIPLEY, Dr. W.E.
Fisheries Advisor
Division for Global Interregional Projects
UNDP
United Nations
New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.

FAO DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

KASAHARA, H.
Director
Fishery Resources and Environment Division

WATZINGER, H.
Director
Fishery Industries Division

KOJIMA, N.
Director
Operations Service

SILVA, L.I.J.
Assistant to the Assistant
Director-General (Fisheries)

IYENGAR, H.D.P.
Project Operations Officer
Operations Service

RAITT, D.F.S.
Fishery Resources Officer
Aquatic Resources Survey and
Evaluation Service
Fishery Resources and Environment Division

APPLEYARD, W.P.
Chief
Fishery Industries Development Service
Fisheries Industries Division

Indian Ocean Programme

BANERJI, S.K.
Senior Fishery Officer
(Stock Assessment and Statistics)

BRANDHORST, W.
Project Manager Designate
Regional Fisheries Project, Southwest
Indonesia/West Australia)

GUSTAFSSON, N.
Senior Fishery Officer (Industry)

HAYASI, S.
Senior Fishery Officer
(Resource Management Specialist)

LABON, A.
Senior Fishery Officer
(Economist and Investment Analyst)

SRIBHIBHADH, A.
Senior Fishery Officer (Government)

UNDP/FAO REVIEW AND EVALUATION MISSION

PARRISH, B.B.
Mission Leader
Director
Marine Laboratory
Aberdeen, Scotland

ANDERSON, A.
Mission Member
Fishery Industries Officer
Fishery Industries Division
FAO
Rome, Italy

SECRETARIAT

Technical Secretary	H.C. Winsor Programme Leader International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme
Secretary	J.D.M. Henderson Senior Fishery Liaison Officer Policy and Planning Service Department of Fisheries
Meetings Officers	Mary Clare de Freitas
	Myrtha Poblete de la Fuente

* * * * *

APPENDIX D

ADDRESS BY DR. H. KASAHARA
DIRECTOR, FISHERY RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT DIVISION

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

In the absence of the Assistant Director-General (Fisheries), it is my pleasure, on behalf of the Director-General, to welcome you to the Fifth Session of the Executive Committee of the Indian Ocean Fishery Commission. It is not necessary for me to outline the history and background of the International Indian Ocean Fishery Survey and Development Programme. The idea was initiated some ten years ago, and I myself have been involved in different capacities. Under the leadership of two excellent programme leaders, first Mr. Marr and now Mr. Winsor, the Programme has gone through the preparatory phase and a substantial part of the main phase. I do not have to mention in detail the progress made since the last session of the Executive Committee held in October 1974; it is described in the relevant background papers. In addition to carrying out large-scale activities directly, including resource surveys in certain areas, the Programme has triggered off a number of national and regional projects that are now in various stages of preparation or implementation.

One of the main items of this session is the consideration of the report of the UNDP/FAO Review and Evaluation Mission which took place in January and February 1976. The report summarizes and evaluates the work of the Programme, and considers future IOP activities. We are fortunate to have at this meeting Mr. Basil Parrish who served as Leader of the Mission. I would not wish to prejudice your own views on the report of the Mission by going into the substance of the report, but it endorses the concept of a semi-autonomous programme unit with broad regional responsibilities to meet growing needs in the Indian Ocean region, and to mobilize resources both within and outside FAO. It recognizes the need for a third phase of five years duration, and states that if such an extension is not forthcoming at the level suggested it would represent a major set-back for multilateral and bilateral fishery arrangements and the countries they serve.

I cannot help feeling that if it were not for the present UNDP crisis the Programme would expand at a rate even greater than in the past resulting in a tremendous network of regional, sub-regional and national fishery projects in the region. Hopefully, the Programme will receive increasing support from non-UNDP sources so that essential activities under the Programme can continue.

The Indian Ocean Programme was the first of the inter-regional efforts towards fishery development and similar undertakings have been made in other regions, including the South China Seas, the Eastern Central Atlantic and the Western Central Atlantic. These programmes in other regions have gained from the experience of the Indian Ocean Programme.

I am sure you will review objectively the achievements and shortcomings of the Programme in the next two days and come up with constructive suggestions for its future activities. Thank you again for giving me the opportunity of speaking before the Committee.

M-40

ISBN 92-5-100036-X